



JOSHUA TREE  
PHASE II COMMUNITY PLAN MEETING  
JUNE 22<sup>ND</sup>, 2005  
MEETING NOTES

---

Public Comment: My recommendations for the plan, although it is not really detailed enough in my opinion to be considered a plan, include the following:

- On page 23, there is a land use policy that talks about the need for adequate water resources. Will this really address our water concerns?
- Need to coordinate with the Joshua Basin Water District
- Water is a critical issue
- How does the plan address hillside areas?
- Street improvements need to be made to be suitable for wheelchairs (sited specific street names)
- The community needs crosswalks (sited specific crosswalk locations)
- There are no maps in the plan reflecting wildlife corridors or sensitive hillside areas.

County Comment: Asked that a written list of those street names and crosswalk locations mentioned be provided to the County.

Public Comment: Who is monitoring the plans?

County Response: This is a policy document, a lot of people are looking for details; however, that normally comes with implementation through future actions. To respond specifically to your question, County staff is responsible for monitoring.

Public Comment:

- On page 34 (policy CI 1.10), need to add Sunfair Road which is also in need of improvements due to flooding.
- On page 39 there is no vision statement or input from the owner of the Roy Williams Airport.
- On page 54 (policy CO 1.4), restricts clearance however we should clear for fire safety.

- Will the Mac ad-hoc document be implemented?

Public Comment:

- I like the overall concept and intro
- However, the short notice and limited review period has not provided adequate time for review of the document.
- I am concerned with the weakness of language such as ‘minimize turf grass’, stronger statements need to be included
- Concern that air quality is not addressed in plan
- (additional comments were read from a written document)

County Response: Asked for a copy of the written document

Public Question: What is the process from policy to approval of development proposals?

County Response: The intent when addressing new proposals is to be consistent. The plan acts as a filter as development plans come in. In the County a land use district is the same as a zone. The plan guides any proposed changes to future zoning and future development

Public Question: Is there an option to vote for zoning?

County Response: You vote for an elected official to the Board of Supervisors who represents the community and makes decisions on major land planning decisions.

Public Comment:

- I do not think it is strictly under the control of the Board of Supervisors
- I like the policy draft language
- However I have a problem with Appendix A: 54 of the policy implementation status are ‘to be determined
- Other desert communities have fewer policies labeled as ‘to be determined’. All policies should be ‘on-going’ and be given equal importance by the Board of Supervisors

Public Comment: I am probably the one dissenting opinion in this group. This plan is a manifesto for the ‘Socialist Republic of Joshua Tree’. It does not represent a common opinion. They only want art stores, not other necessary services to provide for our needs. Leave the zoning alone. We need road improvements, need a bypass and better traffic flow for better air quality. ‘PM-10 Problem?’ We need development impact fees that stay in Joshua Tree. We need

to start over with people who actually represent the majority of the community.

Public Comment:

- On page 27 the SR-62 description should be a 4-lane state highway
- We have problems with traffic on SR-247 & SR-62
- What we have in this community is not a road network it is a maze, the result of poor planning

Public Comment:

Do not see that the water supply issue is being addressed. There are a number of problems with the data in the water supply table:

- Seems that we are already at capacity
- On page 40 it states that adequate water supply facilities will be addressed, how?
- 'Gray Water' has been eliminated from language in plan and replaced with 'recycled'
- At a recent symposium, it was suggested that the County require the use of low-flow water system

Public Comment:

Two main issues:

- Implementation: we need more building inspectors for pre-site inspection
- Code Enforcement: we have a night sky ordinance but what good is it if we do not have night-time Code Enforcement

Public Question:

If there is a policy that is listed as 'to be determined' [in Appendix A], how will it be practically sought after?

County Response:

The intent of the Appendix is to help the Board of Supervisors prioritize their decisions when making funding decisions

Public Question:

On page 88 (policy ED 1.10) why was the community association, advisory council not added?

Public Comment:

I like the natural surroundings, dirt roads and quiet. Need creative architecture and creative living, like in Santa Fe. We know growth is coming let's make it smart.

Public Question:

If all these items remain in the Appendix, are they in limbo or not legally binding?

County Response:

The General Plan is a policy document; it is not typically 'binding' but the land use plan including the standards associated with it is. The policies provide direction that the County can use to develop standards and regulations.

- Public Question: What are the legal ramifications for the implementation status?
- County Response: ‘To be determined’ is a place holder because we have not worked out how or when the follow-up actions will be implemented but we do intend to fill those in with more specific timeframes.
- Public Question: When will state of the art maps be produced, these ones are not clear?
- Public Comment: I love Joshua Tree the way it is. I do not want to see irresponsible development destroy our way of life. Also in response to the person who commented earlier about being the one dissenting opinion and at the same time commented that the majority was not represented – that was a clear contradiction.
- Public Comment: We need regulations that we can follow, if you want it to look like Santa Fe then let’s put in Santa Fe type regulations. The building industry is a large employer in the area. We will follow guidelines that are put in place.
- Public Question: (directed to previous speaker) In your opinion are we too far down the line to downzone?
- Public Response: I like what we have, the 2.5 to 5 acre districts to build ranchettes.
- Public Comment: People are starting to get priced out of the market; we need to keep affordable housing in the community.
- Public Comment: (read written comments which provided a list of issues to be reevaluated for inclusion in the plan)
- Demographic Make-Up – many people within the community are seniors and on a fixed income
  - MBTA
  - Library Expansion
  - Stronger Language
  - Enforcement
  - Air Quality
  - Recreational Facilities and needing approval from adjacent neighbors
  - CUP notification should be expanded to a one mile radius
  - CUP hearing should be held in Joshua Tree
  - Absolutely no building on ridgelines
  - CARE and conservation associations should be recognized for their efforts to work together

Public Question: Will the County accept comments from people who do not live on or own property in Joshua Tree?

County Response: We can't verify every address but we will give more weight to those who live here? What is the concern?

Public Response: Concerned that development interests will or could be disproportionately represented.

County Response: The focus should be on the goals and policies and whether you agree or disagree with those in the plan. This is a big county with a large unincorporated area. As a practical matter we are going to get comments from you folks because you are vested here. This is not a public hearing; this is a public meeting to express your interests and opinions. Written comments are the most valuable, specific comments/revisions on plan/policies are encouraged and everyone should submit comments.

Public Question: On page 39, under E the document states 'Roy Williams Airport has the potential to become. . '. What does that mean?

County Response: It is just recognition that if the airport wanted to be expanded the opportunity is there.

Public Response: To provide some clarification, this language was lifted from the old plan before we realized that the airport was privately owned.

Public Comment: Pointed out that people have private property rights which make it difficult to change zoning.

County Response: It was not in the scope of this General Plan update to do a comprehensive rezoning. It was done more 'surgically'. For example, in areas that may lack the proper area/zoning to accommodate much needed uses, like Service Commercial. We are relying on the existing land use map and this community plan will serve to guide land use changes in the future.